

gone down to dinner, came back with the news. Mr. Mitchell got his clothing and Mrs. Mitchell got her jewels and they went to another hotel.

John Wamaker assisted in taking several American women from the fifth floor. Billie Burke, the actress, was among the first to get out of the hotel and she and her mother sat calmly in a taxicab in Trafalgar Square watching the fire. She says she was dressing when she heard a noise and saw the smoke. She came out in a few minutes, but when she saw sparks blowing past her door she knew that it was time to be getting away from there. Of course Miss Burke did not lose the opportunity to lose her jewels. This is the way she told all about it.

"When we saw those sparks my French maid was nearly crazy. Mother wanted to take the elevator down as her knees were rather stiff but the smoke rushed from the lift so I said to mother, 'You just got out on down stairs.' We had just got out when mother said, 'What about your jewels?' 'Never mind the jewels,' I said to mother, just as calmly as that, and by that time we were on the second floor. Mother said that she just couldn't go a bit further, she was going to jump the rest of the way. Of course I wouldn't let her jump, and we managed to get down to the first floor.

"I was dressed in a peignoir, but some one wrapped a coat around me in the cloakroom and a nice woman stuck a few hairpins in my hair and I came out here with mother to sit and read until it was all over. The firemen looked just splendid, moving about so calmly and telling one quietly where to go. Really, I felt quite angry when I saw a wretched American woman on the stairs and heard her crying, 'Murder, let me out!'

Ex-Gov. Frank Brown of Maryland and his son, who were on the second floor, started down to dinner when they smelled the smoke. They returned to their room, gathered some clothing and went to another hotel. Mr. Brown said that the people behaved remarkably well and that there was very little panic.

Miss Jessie Gardiner, Mrs. C. W. Shipley and her son of Chicago had a particularly hard experience. They arrived at the hotel from Oxford after 6 o'clock and within an hour were without their wardrobes. When James R. Keene's valet told him that there was a fire he descended to the hallway, where he calmly waited for the operations. He was found by THE SUN's correspondent calmly smoking a cigar. Mr. Keene said:

"This doesn't look like much of a fire." He commented upon the "disgraceful slowness of the fire brigade," which he said had been fully twenty-five minutes in getting water on the flames. Mr. Keene remained about the hotel for an hour before he left for his home. He was not in the least worried about his clothes or his personal belongings.

A. W. Preston, head of the fruit trust, was in the smoke room when the fire started. He went to his room and secured his things without difficulty. Other Americans who were registered at the Carlton were F. W. Woolworth, the five and ten cent store man; W. C. Breed of Philadelphia, Stevenson Scott of Chicago, Ansel Oppenheim of New York, James Lee Finney, the actor; Mr. and Mrs. George Barton French, F. B. Harvey of Baltimore and Mr. and Mrs. E. W. Farquy of Pittsburgh.

Altogether there were about 200 guests, mostly Americans.

Thomas A. Edison left the hotel this morning for Boulogne. Many other Americans sailed for home or left for the Continent to-day. No dinner or supper was served in the restaurant, but the smoke room and bar were continued in business. They were havens for those who had exciting times escaping the flames, while throughout the progress of the fire some in evening dress and others in every stage of undress remained in the flooded hallway, which was crowded with trunks, boxes and valuables.

A. L. Pratt and Mrs. Pratt were dressing for dinner on the top floor when their attention was attracted by the crowd in the street. Mr. Pratt said that there was a fire somewhere. They saw sparks and smoke and they hurried to the street. Mrs. Pratt was unable to save any of her valuables.

George Ernest Holmes of Saskatoon, Canada, who was on his first visit to London, escaped lightly clad. He said that he could not say too much for the firemen.

"They asked us quickly and courteously to go here and there and were as quick as lightning," he said. R. M. Huxer of Philadelphia was on the third floor just finishing dressing. He ran for his valet several times and went out into the passage, where he saw the flames roaring up at the door of a pantry at the end of the hall.

"The guests were leaving their rooms," said Mr. Huxer, "and we connected the hose with the fire hydrant outside my door and helped the firemen, who were rushing up. I met Lord Poultet and one or two other men and together we explored the floor above to the fifth, finding everywhere that the people were behaving with the utmost coolness and working hard to put out the flames.

"Lord Poultet helped rescue several ladies who were choking with smoke and carried them downstairs to the office. The smoke on the sixth floor was too bad to penetrate. Everybody kept handing out wet towels and sponges to the firemen who appeared at the windows.

Mr. Edison, who left the hotel this morning, went to join his wife for a six weeks motor trip on the Continent. Apart from the one death there were few accidents. There were only four patients taken to the Charing Cross Hospital, three of whom were firemen overcome by the smoke and heat, and one guest who was burned on the hand.

Judge Conyn was dressing and deceased half dressed. He sent a servant for the rest of his clothes and in the course of half an hour was fully dressed save for his hat, which he got eventually drenched and dirty, but still it was a hat which the Judge wore with dignity. Herr Derburg, formerly a German Colonial Secretary, escaped with his luggage to the elevator. John Millington, an American, was ill abed when a servant entered his room and told him to run for his life. He donned a few clothes and alarmed his wife, who was in the next room partly dressed. They ran together to the street. They lost most of their baggage.

The sixth floor, where most of the servants were quartered, was a mass of flames in a short time after the fire was discovered, and many of the servants crawled out of the windows and held to the stone ledges. Fortunately they kept their heads and listened to the cries of "Don't jump," from firemen and spectators in the street. All were soon rescued by means of ladders and fire escapes. There were several exciting rescues by firemen on ladders from the rear of the hotel.

There were six lines of hose at one

time stretched from the street to the roof. Some of the hose that was imperfect burst and sent a shower of water over the spectators.

The new automatic ladders were most useful to the firemen, as with their assistance they were able to fight the fire from the level of the sixth floor, where the fire was hottest, pouring in jets of water at a height of nearly 100 feet. There was a constant stream of salvage men and servants taking out carpets, furniture and silverware and piling them in the street.

There was little disorder and scarcely anything that bordered on panic, which was quite remarkable considering the rapidity with which the fire got hold of the building and the fact that the guests were mostly in their bedrooms. They were dressing for dinner and at the cry of alarm began to swarm down the staircases, carrying hand luggage. The women gripped their jewel cases and dressing bags. There was a strange medley of firemen and guests in the entrance hall, which was soon flooded by several inches of water, while a continuous cascade poured down the stairs.

The fire was well under control at 8:30 P. M. and by 9:15 the water was shut off. The electric light had failed on the upper floors, but below and outside it remained, greatly to the advantage of the firemen.

#### FINNEY A WELL-KNOWN ACTOR.

James Lee Finney, who played in New York a few years ago in Jesse Lynch Williams' play "The Stolen Story," was born in St. Louis, Mo., in 1853. As a boy he studied art in New York under Maynard because of his parents' objection to his following his natural bent, which was the stage.

He was a failure as an artist and launched himself as an actor in Lawrence Barrett's company, playing minor juvenile roles. A few years after his professional debut he played *Oscar* with Booth in "Hamlet."

Later he joined the Frohman stock company and made his first success as *Capitan Lavelle* in "Under the Red Robe." Some of his other parts were in "Frocks and Frills," "A Fool and His Money," "The Man in the Case" and "The Man on the Roof."

Finney played his last part in "The Deep Purple" at the Lyric Theatre, this city. He had been reengaged to appear in his original role, that of a blackmailer, in the Armstrong-Mizner melodrama.

#### CONTROLLER BAY INQUIRY.

Proposition to Continue It at Once and Report to the House.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 9.—Pointing out that the Controller Bay inquiry has been abandoned and charging that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department has refused to permit competent or material witnesses that appear before it to testify, Representative Humphrey of Washington to-day introduced a resolution proposing that the investigation be made by a special committee of five members. He will speak on the resolution in the near future.

By reason of Executive order, says the resolution, 12,500 acres were withdrawn from the Chugach National Forest Reserve of Alaska and restored to settlement. It has been plainly charged that such withdrawal resulted from a private corporation a monopoly of the shipping facilities of Controller Bay. Charges have been made reflecting upon the official integrity of the President and the Secretary of the Interior and other public officials in connection with such withdrawal. The Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, entered upon an investigation of the facts, has failed and refused to permit competent and material witnesses to testify and has abandoned such investigation.

#### PETER, THE ALLEGED SPY.

Austrian Government Making an Investigation as to Whether He is Count Gratz.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 9.—The War Department was informally notified to-day by the Austrian Embassy that an investigation is being made by the embassy and the home government as to the whereabouts of Count Gratz, who is supposed to be at Prague, Bohemia, and who, according to the story of Miss Clara Dyer, is *Peter* of the Coast Artillery Corps. The Austrian Government is making the investigation on its own initiative.

#### MEXICAN TROOPS RUSHED OFF.

Three Regiments Sent to Cuernavaca to Dispel Zapata's Men.

MEXICO CITY, Aug. 9.—The Government rushed three regiments of troops to Cuernavaca on a special train this morning. It is rumored that Gen. Zapata has been having difficulties with the Government recently over the question of mustering out his men, who have risen against the Government and are fortifying the city of Cuernavaca. The Government says that it has received no such notice, but private advices confirm the rumor. Several more cars are being held in readiness to transport troops if necessary.

A committee called upon Francisco I. Madero to-day to get a definite statement of his attitude regarding the Gomez brothers, whom the anti-revolutionists are inclined to support. It seems that Madero has broken with Emilio Gomez and that his relations with Francisco are exceedingly strained. It is believed that the party will endorse Gomez even against the wishes of Madero.

These inquiries, said he, do not come within the scope of this investigation. We are dealing with the affairs of corporations. We have nothing to do with the personal activities of the officers of such corporations. That is the position I take, and I want it known to everybody interested or concerned."

It is to the question relative to the New York Life, Mr. Littleton said he would make known his decision in this instance when the issue was joined.

Chairman Stanley replied that it was his duty to answer the question in regard to the New York Life and that he would not yield a jot on it. He said Representative Beall would repeat the question.

"Mr. Beall will and may exercise a wise discretion in the matter," added Mr. Stanley, "but there is no doubt in my mind as to the relevancy and competency of this question in relation to the inquiry. Should Mr. Beall insist upon an answer the chair will hold to his previous ruling and will not change his position under any circumstances."

Mr. Beall then put the question again to Mr. Perkins.

Before the witness could answer Mr. Lindabury rose. He told of the \$10,000 contribution made by the Steel Corporation in 1904 and of the willingness of the corporation to submit the record showing the expenditure. He said he objected to the affairs of the Steel Corporation being tied in with the question of the New York Life Insurance Company. He did not want the corporation's case prejudiced in this way. He expressed the opinion that Steel Corporation officials had not made contributions or with which they had been reimbursed with corporation funds. This is what was done in the case of the New York Life.

It was then that Mr. Beall announced that he would not press the issue further, being content with the assurance made by Mr. Lindabury. The contempt proceedings thus blew up with a loud report, much to the astonishment of the crowd that thronged the hearing room. It was generally suspected that the scene just enacted came about as a result of an agreement between the corporation and the committee, which was denied by members of the committee.

Representative Beall resumed his examination of Mr. Perkins. He asked three questions, as follows:

"Did you make contributions with the understanding that you would be reimbursed by the corporation? Did you make contributions with the expectation that you would be reimbursed? Did you make contributions in the belief that you would be reimbursed in whole or in part?"

To all of which Mr. Perkins answered in the negative.

"Have you any knowledge of the \$10,000 contribution referred to by Mr. Lindabury?" asked Mr. Beall.

"I never heard of it until he mentioned it," replied the witness.

Representative Beall then branched off to the panic of 1907. He read a statement which he had been given by Mr. Perkins in October, 1907, in which this sentence appeared: "The chief sore spot was the Trust Company of America."

From this Mr. Beall drew the inference that the New York Life directors had been bent on discrediting the trust company in the eyes of the public. He asked Mr. Perkins if the head of a press association and certain newspapers had not refused to publish the statement.

"Not to my knowledge," replied Mr. Perkins.

Reference was again made to the plan advocated by Mr. Perkins and put through by the Steel Corporation, which was a 7 percent cumulative dividend was converted into \$250,000,000 worth of 5 percent bonds.

An address before the steel executive committee, read from the committee's minutes yesterday by Mr. Stanley, Mr. Perkins urged the conversion plan on the ground that it would bring in \$500,000 cash for practically nothing and reduced the fixed charges by \$1,500,000 a year.

Mr. Perkins insisted that the transaction was perfectly legal and moral and that its legality had been tested in the courts and the company's position sustained. He denied emphatically that in order to induce the holders to exchange the 7 percent stocks for 5 percent bonds the price of steel preferred had been depressed.

He testified that the stockholders consented to the exchange of the 7 percent bonds for the 5 percent stocks and that the corporation to force them to do so.

Before he concluded his testimony to-day Mr. Perkins read a long statement explaining the purpose of the conversion plan.

After discussing several methods suggested for raising money Mr. Perkins in his statement said:

"It was finally found impossible to secure a pledge of the \$500,000 preferred stock, but the best that could be done was to organize a syndicate that would agree to the following:

First. Purchase and lodge with J. P. Morgan & Co. \$500,000 of preferred stock, one-half of it to be held by the syndicate and the other half by the option of the steel corporation for second mortgage bonds.

Third. Take second mortgage bonds from the steel corporation at par in exchange for the first mortgage bonds. The syndicate to take the bonds at 4 percent commission on all the bonds it took in exchange for stock and a 4 percent commission on all the bonds it took at par for cash, so that if the syndicate should be unable to find a market for the bonds it would be able to sell them at 95 percent of the face value of the bonds.

The steel corporation reserved the right to offer to every preferred stockholder in the corporation the option to subscribe for these new bonds to the extent of 60 percent of his preferred stock. In view of the fact that the steel corporation had made a contract with the syndicate, if any preferred stockholder exercised his right and took 40 percent of bonds in exchange for his stock the syndicate would be placed in the position where it would only get 20 percent of the \$500,000 of bonds. The syndicate would be left with \$400,000 of preferred stock on its hands, although it pledged itself to tie up this \$500,000 of stock for eighteen months and could not sell it or in any way dispose of it.

In consideration of this risk the syndicate was given the right to receive a commission of 4 percent on such bonds as were sold. Preferred stockholders not members of the syndicate could only be received by it provided the entire transaction of purchasing \$500,000 of preferred stock and returning it and then taking and placing on the market \$500,000 of second mortgage bonds at par is completed and consummated.

It is true that the money could have been raised by stopping dividends on the preferred stock for one year or by a loan on the common stock for two years and a half. This course was deemed unfair to the stockholders, and particularly to the holders of common stock, which stock was held by thousands of small holders.

The committee in the course of the day's proceedings adopted a resolution calling upon the corporation to submit in evidence the minute books of its subsidiary companies.

Texas Governor Puts Ban on Liquor Legislation.

AUSTIN, Tex., Aug. 9.—Gov. O. B. Colquitt has refused to submit liquor legislation of any sort to the Legislature, now in special session. He gave official notice to-day in a message to the House. This action of the governor is in accordance with regulation laws at this session unless the Governor changes his mind.

#### PERKINS NOT IN CONTEMPT.

STANLEY COMMITTEE DECIDES NOT TO COERCE HIM.

Lawyer Tells of Steel Corporation's Contribution of \$10,000 in 1904 and Promises to Give Details Later—Littleton Closes Committee Down.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 9.—George W. Perkins, formerly of J. P. Morgan & Co., will not be hauled to the bar of the House on a charge of contempt, as was threatened yesterday by Chairman Stanley of the steel investigating committee because of Mr. Perkins' refusal to answer certain questions relative to campaign contributions. It looks very much as if the committee, after beating the tom-toms loudly, marched right up to the Perkins contempt question, then turned around and marched right back again.

Chairman Stanley and his Democratic associates insist, however, that a statement by R. V. Lindabury, counsel for the Steel Corporation, yielded in part the information sought by the committee and that a promise made by him, if fulfilled, will place in the hands of the investigators complete information relative to political contributions by the Steel Corporation.

After a day of executive sessions by the committee, at which full consideration was given to the charge of Chairman Stanley that Mr. Perkins was guilty of contempt and of contempt, Mr. Lindabury made a statement in open session that the Steel Corporation contributed \$10,000 in 1904 "either to a State or national committee," he could not recall which. That was the Roosevelt Presidential campaign year.

Mr. Lindabury assured the committee that the corporation's record bearing a notation of this expenditure would be placed in evidence in due season. He further told the committee that he had no doubt the Steel Corporation would be willing to submit a statement in detail showing the amounts disbursed for political purposes by the corporation since the date of its organization.

"I think I can assure the committee that we will give this information, but before making a definite promise I want to consult others," said Mr. Lindabury.

"In view of the frank statement of counsel," says Representative Beall of Texas, who put the questions yesterday that prompted Chairman Stanley to make the threat that he would proceed against Mr. Perkins for contempt, "I want to say that that assurance obviates the necessity for further inquiries along this line."

The committee concurred in Mr. Beall's view of the case.

Several reasons are advanced by critics of the Democratic members of the committee for their alleged change of front. It is said in the first place that Representatives Bartlett of Georgia and Littleton of New York refused to uphold the ruling of Chairman Stanley that Mr. Perkins be required to answer the question calling for information relative to campaign contributions made by the New York Life Insurance Company and the Steel Corporation. The question that provoked yesterday's flareup was put in this way:

"Will you please make a comparison of the methods of the New York Life Insurance Company in keeping its minutes as contrasted with the methods of the Steel Corporation?"

Behind this was the intimation that the life insurance company years ago had covered up political contributions by means of a "yellow dog" fund and that as Mr. Perkins was familiar with this scheme and the way it operated, he perhaps had knowledge of the same system in the management of the Steel Corporation. Mr. Perkins was willing to answer the question, but Counsel Lindabury advised against it. Then Mr. Perkins was told that if he persisted in his refusal he would imperil his personal liberty. There the matter rested until this morning.

Representative Littleton was not in Washington yesterday, but on being apprised of the developments in the Perkins case he hurried back to the capital and reported this morning. It was Mr. Littleton who requested the committee to go into executive session to consider the situation.

The first proposition discussed at this meeting involved Mr. Perkins' refusal to answer a question in regard to his personal contributions to political organizations. Mr. Littleton moved that the committee reconsider its vote of yesterday upholding Chairman Stanley's ruling that this question was in order and must be answered. The Littleton motion was carried.

Chairman Stanley is said to have acquiesced only when it became clear that Messrs. Littleton and Bartlett, Democrats, intended to side with the Republicans. Mr. Stanley's friends insist to-night, however, that he was in thorough accord with the opinions held by Representatives Littleton and Bartlett that personal contributions do not come within the scope of the investigation.

The question of personal campaign contributions was the only one discussed at the morning executive session and in the afternoon the committee got together again to consider the other features of the Perkins case. Chairman Stanley read the transcript of yesterday's testimony. Mr. Littleton quoted the questions that resulted in a clash between Witness Perkins and the Democratic committee.

"These inquiries," said he, "do not come

within the scope of this investigation. We are dealing with the affairs of corporations. We have nothing to do with the personal activities of the officers of such corporations. That is the position I take, and I want it known to everybody interested or concerned."

It is to the question relative to the New York Life, Mr. Littleton said he would make known his decision in this instance when the issue was joined.

Chairman Stanley replied that it was his duty to answer the question in regard to the New York Life and that he would not yield a jot on it. He said Representative Beall would repeat the question.

"Mr. Beall will and may exercise a wise discretion in the matter," added Mr. Stanley, "but there is no doubt in my mind as to the relevancy and competency of this question in relation to the inquiry. Should Mr. Beall insist upon an answer the chair will hold to his previous ruling and will not change his position under any circumstances."

Mr. Beall then put the question again to Mr. Perkins.

Before the witness could answer Mr. Lindabury rose. He told of the \$10,000 contribution made by the Steel Corporation in 1904 and of the willingness of the corporation to submit the record showing the expenditure. He said he objected to the affairs of the Steel Corporation being tied in with the question of the New York Life Insurance Company. He did not want the corporation's case prejudiced in this way. He expressed the opinion that Steel Corporation officials had not made contributions or with which they had been reimbursed with corporation funds. This is what was done in the case of the New York Life.

It was then that Mr. Beall announced that he would not press the issue further, being content with the assurance made by Mr. Lindabury. The contempt proceedings thus blew up with a loud report, much to the astonishment of the crowd that thronged the hearing room. It was generally suspected that the scene just enacted came about as a result of an agreement between the corporation and the committee, which was denied by members of the committee.

Representative Beall resumed his examination of Mr. Perkins. He asked three questions, as follows:

"Did you make contributions with the understanding that you would be reimbursed by the corporation? Did you make contributions with the expectation that you would be reimbursed? Did you make contributions in the belief that you would be reimbursed in whole or in part?"

To all of which Mr. Perkins answered in the negative.

"Have you any knowledge of the \$10,000 contribution referred to by Mr. Lindabury?" asked Mr. Beall.

"I never heard of it until he mentioned it," replied the witness.

Representative Beall then branched off to the panic of 1907. He read a statement which he had been given by Mr. Perkins in October, 1907, in which this sentence appeared: "The chief sore spot was the Trust Company of America."

From this Mr. Beall drew the inference that the New York Life directors had been bent on discrediting the trust company in the eyes of the public. He asked Mr. Perkins if the head of a press association and certain newspapers had not refused to publish the statement.

"Not to my knowledge," replied Mr. Perkins.

Reference was again made to the plan advocated by Mr. Perkins and put through by the Steel Corporation, which was a 7 percent cumulative dividend was converted into \$250,000,000 worth of 5 percent bonds.

An address before the steel executive committee, read from the committee's minutes yesterday by Mr. Stanley, Mr. Perkins urged the conversion plan on the ground that it would bring in \$500,000 cash for practically nothing and reduced the fixed charges by \$1,500,000 a year.

Mr. Perkins insisted that the transaction was perfectly legal and moral and that its legality had been tested in the courts and the company's position sustained. He denied emphatically that in order to induce the holders to exchange the 7 percent stocks for 5 percent bonds the price of steel preferred had been depressed.

He testified that the stockholders consented to the exchange of the 7 percent bonds for the 5 percent stocks and that the corporation to force them to do so.

Before he concluded his testimony to-day Mr. Perkins read a long statement explaining the purpose of the conversion plan.

After discussing several methods suggested for raising money Mr. Perkins in his statement said:

"It was finally found impossible to secure a pledge of the \$500,000 preferred stock, but the best that could be done was to organize a syndicate that would agree to the following:

First. Purchase and lodge with J. P. Morgan & Co. \$500,000 of preferred stock, one-half of it to be held by the syndicate and the other half by the option of the steel corporation for second mortgage bonds.

Third. Take second mortgage bonds from the steel corporation at par in exchange for the first mortgage bonds. The syndicate to take the bonds at 4 percent commission on all the bonds it took in exchange for stock and a 4 percent commission on all the bonds it took at par for cash, so that if the syndicate should be unable to find a market for the bonds it would be able to sell them at 95 percent of the face value of the bonds.

The steel corporation reserved the right to offer to every preferred stockholder in the corporation the option to subscribe for these new bonds to the extent of 60 percent of his preferred stock. In view of the fact that the steel corporation had made a contract with the syndicate, if any preferred stockholder exercised his right and took 40 percent of bonds in exchange for his stock the syndicate would be placed in the position where it would only get 20 percent of the \$500,000 of bonds. The syndicate would be left with \$400,000 of preferred stock on its hands, although it pledged itself to tie up this \$500,000 of stock for eighteen months and could not sell it or in any way dispose of it.

In consideration of this risk the syndicate was given the right to receive a commission of 4 percent on such bonds as were sold. Preferred stockholders not members of the syndicate could only be received by it provided the entire transaction of purchasing \$500,000 of preferred stock and returning it and then taking and placing on the market \$500,000 of second mortgage bonds at par is completed and consummated.

It is true that the money could have been raised by stopping dividends on the preferred stock for one year or by a loan on the common stock for two years and a half. This course was deemed unfair to the stockholders, and particularly to the holders of common stock, which stock was held by thousands of small holders.

The committee in the course of the day's proceedings adopted a resolution calling upon the corporation to submit in evidence the minute books of its subsidiary companies.

Texas Governor Puts Ban on Liquor Legislation.

AUSTIN, Tex., Aug. 9.—Gov. O. B. Colquitt has refused to submit liquor legislation of any sort to the Legislature, now in special session. He gave official notice to-day in a message to the House. This action of the governor is in accordance with regulation laws at this session unless the Governor changes his mind.

Chicago Thinks She Has 2,500,000 Population.

CHICAGO, Aug. 9.—Chicago's new City Directory will be ready for delivery August 21, and it is asserted that it will contain enough names to convince the most sceptical that the population of this city has passed the 2,500,000 mark.

Work on the new directory is being rushed night and day in order to have the first books ready by the date set.

#### DENOUNCE ASTOR MARRIAGE.

PRELATES OF MANY CHURCHES SPEAK IN REPROOF.

Bishop Schwabach Says Miss Force Is Being Sacrificed to Wealth and Social Ambition—Too Bad for the Young Woman, Says Bishop Whitehead.

LACROSSE, Wis., Aug. 9.—That the coming marriage of John Jacob Astor to Madeleine Force will be the sacrifice of a young and innocent girl upon the altar of greed, was the declaration of the Right Rev. James Schwabach, Bishop of the Lacrosse Diocese of the Roman Catholic Church, to-day. Bishop Schwabach declared that the marriage would be illegal in the eyes of the law. The parents of the girl are willing to sacrifice her for wealth and social position, he said.

FOND DU LAC, Wis., Aug. 9.—Bishop Charles C. Grafton commenting on the approaching wedding of Col. John Jacob Astor to Miss Madeleine Force, said to-day that he held the same opinion as that expressed by Bishop Suffragan Charles S. Burck of the Episcopal diocese of New York, who said the majority of the Bishops and ministers of the church are opposed to divorced persons remarrying at all, although the laws of the church do not prohibit absolutely such marriages.

Bishop Grafton said he would take the same stand as the New York prelate were similar circumstances to arise within his jurisdiction.

CINCINNATI, Aug. 9.—While the Astor case is nothing worse than many others, I am glad to see that the newspapers and the people of this country are so decided against the wedding, said Bishop John H. Walden of the Methodist Episcopal Church this afternoon.

Bishop David H. Moore of the same church says this present case is nothing less than disgraceful.

Bishop Boyd Vincent of the Episcopal church is quoted as saying that he will neither officiate nor allow this wedding to be held in any of the churches of his denomination in the southern diocese of Ohio.

"I think the present case shows that public disapproval through the press can work great good in any line and therefore I speak as a churchman against the open rebellion to the laws of the church by the so-called society-elect," said Bishop Walden. "No minister of any Christian church could properly perform the ceremony at the Astor-Force wedding."

Bishop Moore says: "The supposed sanctity of this marriage is really awful. It not only has the permission of society but will be attended by the society people. I do not think it right to allow men or women to accumulate wives or husbands as they allow fishermen to acquire fish. However, we must blame the greater part of this practice on the women. They sanction the violation of the law by telling men they will marry them. They refuse to be refused, and then we will have a better state of affairs in America."

PITTSBURGH, Aug. 9.—Bishop Cortland Whitehead of the Episcopal church here and thirty-three other members of various denominations to-day went on record as opposed to the proposed marriage of Col. John Jacob Astor and Miss Madeleine Force.

"I think with Bishop Doane of New York," said Bishop Whitehead, "that this marriage should not take place and that it is impossible for any Episcopal clergyman to marry Mr. Astor and Miss Force. Such a thing would be contrary to the laws of the Church and to the New Testament, too."

It is too bad for the young woman, as it must place her in an embarrassing position. Of course they may get a minister of some other church to unite them, but that only shows that the standards of some churches in this matter are not as